UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/692,384	10/23/2003	Todd R. Manion	306544.01	8443

69316 7590 07/13/2010

MICROSOFT CORPORATION
ONE MICROSOFT WAY
REDMOND, WA 98052

EXAMINER	
NGUYEN, DUSTIN	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2454	

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
07/13/2010	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

DBOUTON@MICROSOFT.COM
vffiling@microsoft.com
stevensp@microsoft.com

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/692,384	MANION ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	DUSTIN NGUYEN	2454	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *15 April 2010*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *43-58* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *43-58* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 44-58 are presented for examination.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claim 43 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ogdon et al. [US Patent No 6,161,137], in view of Trossen [US Patent Application No 2004/0128344].

4. As per claim 43, Ogdon discloses the invention as claimed including a computer-readable storage medium that does not comprise a carrier wave embodying a program of instruction executable by a computer for performing a method of enabling a presentation from a first computing device to many second computing devices using an application program [i.e. a presentation system is disclosed for distributing a performance of a presentation synchronously to a plurality of client nodes] [Abstract] comprising:

providing an application programming interface on the first computing device that registers the second computing device with the first computing device [i.e. a pre-show control

system for providing audience members and potential audience members with presentation related information both for registering for presentation performances and for establishing initial network connections] [140, Figure 1A; and col 10, lines 30-col 11, lines 21];

providing an application programming interface for the second computing device to request an invitation to view the presentation from the first computing device [i.e. invitation subsystem] [col 9, lines 63-col 10, lines 4];

providing a callback method on the first computing device wherein the callback method communicates an acceptance to the second computing device that invitation to view the presentation from the first computing device has been accepted [i.e. providing encoded presentation invitation network addresses to clients] [col 16, lines 57-67];

providing an application programming interface on the first computing device for advertising that a presentation is available for the second computing devices [i.e. provide the client with excerpts of other presentations as well as advertisements] [col 19, lines 45-51];

providing an application programming interface on the first computing device for disconnecting the first computing from providing the presentation to the second computing device [i.e. terminate] [col 21, lines 7-24];

providing an application program interface on the first computing device for inviting the second computing device to view the presentation [col 9, lines 57-col 10, lines 4]; and

providing an application program interface on the first computing device for responding to a request from the second computing device for an invitation to view the presentation [i.e. login] [col 18, lines 58-col 19, lines 29].

Ogdon does not specifically disclose

providing an application programming interface on the first computing device for un-registering the second computing device from the first computing device.

Trossen discloses

providing an application programming interface on the first computing device for un-registering the second computing device from the first computing device [i.e. de-registration of desired services/content] [Abstract; and paragraphs 0006, 0011, 0027 and 0043].

It would have been obvious to a person skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Ogdon and Trossen because the teaching of Trossen would enable to manage and control service and/or content in the network.

5. Claims 44-58 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ogdon et al. [US Patent No 6,161,137], in view of Trossen [US Patent Application No 2004/0128344], and further in view of Weisman et al. [US Patent Application No 2002/0112058].

6. As per claim 44, Ogdon and Trossen do not specifically disclose providing an application program interface on the first computing device for establishing communication between the first computing device and a projector; providing an application program interface on the first computing device for disconnecting the first computing device from communicating with the projector; providing an application program interface on the first computing device for obtaining capabilities of the projector; providing an application program interface on the first computing device for obtaining state information of the projector; providing an application program interface on the first computing device for obtaining display settings for the projector; and providing an application program interface on the first computing device for setting display settings on the projector. Weisman discloses providing an application program interface on the first computing device for establishing communication between the first computing device and a projector [paragraphs 0106, 0643, 0644 and 0648]; providing an application program interface on the first computing device for disconnecting the first computing device from communicating with the projector [paragraphs 0644, 0648-0650]; providing an application program interface on the first computing device for obtaining capabilities of the projector [i.e. discover device] [paragraphs 0814, 0817, 0819 and 0859]; providing an application program interface on the first computing device for obtaining state information of the projector [paragraphs 0045, 0062, 0125, and 0151]; providing an application program interface on the first computing device for obtaining display settings for the projector [paragraphs 0817, 0860 and 1000]; and providing an application program interface on the first computing device for setting display settings on the projector [paragraphs 0704-0707]. It would have been obvious to a person skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Ogdon, Trossen and Weisman because

the teaching of Weisman would enable to provide a programming interface for logical devices and bridges to expose their services to the peer networking protocol using the peer networking protocol implementation of the host [Weisman, paragraph 0004].

7. As per claim 45, Weisman discloses wherein providing an application programming interface on the first computing device that registers the second computing device with the first computing device further comprises: receiving at the first computing device a friendly name from the second computing device; receiving at the first computing device an invite from the second computing device wherein the invite comprises a callback function invoked when the first computing device invites a second computing device; and responding from the first computing device with a handle to the second computing device wherein the handle is used if the second computing device attempts to disconnect from the first computing device at a point in the future [paragraphs 0834, 0209-0216].

8. As per claim 46, Weisman discloses wherein providing an application programming interface on the first computing device for un-registering the second computing device from the first computing device further comprises receiving at the first computing device a handle returned from the register function [paragraphs 0097, 0468 and 0559].

9. As per claim 47, Weisman discloses wherein providing an application programming interface for the second computing device to request an invitation to view the presentation from

the first computing device further comprises: receiving at the first computing device the UDN of the first computing device from the second computing device to ensure the first computing device is the device desired to be connected; receiving at the first computing device a handle from the second computing device; and communicating an invitation comprising from the first computing device to the second computing device if the first computing device desires to allow the second computing device to view the presentation [paragraphs 0067, 0068, 0161, 0163 and 0184].

10. As per claim 48, Weisman discloses wherein providing a callback method on the first computing device wherein the callback method communicates an acceptance to the second computing device that invitation to view the presentation from the first computing device has been accepted further comprises: receiving at the first computing device an invitation from the second computing device; receiving at the first computing device a friendly presentation name for the second computing device; receiving at the first computing device a friendly name for the presenter using the first computing device [paragraphs 0834, 0209-0216]; and communication a successful connection indication if the connection is successful [paragraphs 0209-0216].

11. As per claim 49, Trossen discloses wherein providing an application programming interface on the first computing device for advertising that a presentation is available for the second computing devices further comprises: on the first computing device, registering with a UPnP service comprising communicating a friendly name of the presentation, a friendly name of

the presenter and a callback function from the second computing device to a UPnP service [paragraphs 0002 and 0004]; and communicating a handle to the second computing device if a presentation session is successfully created [paragraphs 0042, 0048 and 0057].

12. As per claim 50, Weisman discloses wherein providing an application programming interface on the first computing device for disconnecting the first computing from providing the presentation to the second computing device further comprises receiving at the first computing device a request to stop the presentation including the name of the presentation to be stopped [paragraphs 0100, 0108 and 0643].

13. As per claim 51, Weisman discloses wherein providing an application program interface on the first computing device to enable the first computing device to respond to an invitation request from the second computing device comprising: receiving at the first computing device the friendly name of the second computing device; receiving at the first computing device the UDN of the second computing device; communicating from the first computing device to the second computing device an invitation [paragraphs 0067, 0068, 0161, 0163 and 0184].

14. As per claim 52, Wiesman discloses wherein providing an application program interface on the first computing device for inviting the second computing device to view the presentation further comprises: receiving at the first computing device a handle for the presentation from the

second computing device; receiving at the first computing device the UDN of the second computing device; receiving at the first computing device the invitation from the second computing device that was provided by the first computing device [paragraphs 0067, 0068, 0161, 0163 and 0184].

15. As per claim 53, Ogdon discloses wherein providing an application program interface on the first computing device for inviting the second computing device to view the presentation further comprises receiving the presentation name and the presenter name [Figure 3].

16. As per claim 54, Weisman discloses wherein providing an application program interface on the first computing device for establishing communication between the first computing device and a projector further comprises: receiving at the first computing device the handle for the presentation from the second computing device; receiving at the first computing device the invitation to be provided to the projector; and communicating a session token [paragraphs 0067, 0068, 0161, 0163 and 0184].

17. As per claim 54, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above in claims 43 and 47.

18. As per claims 55-58, they are rejected for similar reasons as stated above in claims 43 and 47.

19. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dustin Nguyen whose telephone number is (571) 272-3971. The examiner can normally be reached on flex.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nathan Flynn can be reached at (571) 272-1915. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/DUSTIN NGUYEN/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2454